REMARKS

Claims 1 through 21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8, 10, 19 and 21 are hereby amended. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the Final Office Action mailed October 16, 2008, [hereinafter "Oct. 16th Final"], and request reconsideration.

Allowable subject matter of claims 8, 16 and 21

Applicants thank the Examiner for the acknowledgement that claims 8, 16, and 21, although objected to, are directed to allowable subject matter if rewritten. See Oct. 16th Final, page 4, ¶ 5. Therefore, claims 8, 16 and 21 have been amended to be in independent form and include all limitations of the previous base claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 16 and 21 are in condition for allowance.

Summary of the Examiner Interviews conducted telephonically on on December 2, 2008 and February 18, 2009

A first Examiner Interview was conducted on December 2, 2008, [hereinafter "First Interview"], telephonically between Examiner Phillip H. Nguyen and Applicants' representative, Joseph T. Cygan (Reg. No. 50,937), to discuss the 102(b) reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,035,124 (issued Mar. 7, 2000) to Ng, of record, [hereinafter "Ng"] and proposed amendments to the independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to clarify the subject matter. Applicants reviewed Ng to show that the present claims distinguish since Ng only applies to scalar operations and global value numbering with respect to such scalar values. The Examiner and Applicants agreed that Applicants would amend to further clarify terminology used in claims 1, 10 and 19.

A second Examiner Interview was conducted on February 18, 2009, [hereinafter "Second Interview"], telephonically between Examiner Phillip H. Nguyen and Applicants' representative, Joseph T. Cygan (Reg. No. 50,937), to discuss further proposed amendments to the independent

claims 1, 10 and 19. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the application on both occasions.

During both the First and Second Interview the Examiner expressed concern that the various value numbers and hash values were not distinguished clearly enough in the claims. This was also stated in the Final Office Action. See Oct. 16th Final, page 4, ¶ 5. Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 have therefore been amended to add inherent language that further describes the various value numbers.

The Examiner also expressed concern that the terminology "superword register" was not clear and, as stated in the Office Action, did not "make a distinction from any normal registers of the Central Processing Unit (CPU). See Oct. 16th Final, page 2, ¶ 4. The Applicants submitted during the Second Interview that "superword register" is terminology that would be understood by those of ordinary skill and that, in addition, Applicants' Specification provides adequate context and definitions so that one or ordinary skill may understand the scope of the subject matter of the claims. Applicants have also filed an IDS with a technical paper showing that the terminology has been used and is understood by those of ordinary skill.

The Examiner also expressed concern during the Second Interview that the "instruction" being checked for redundancy was not clearly defined as having an operation code and operand value numbers. Therefore claims 1, 10 and 19 have also been amended to recite, "*an instruction that comprises an operation code and corresponding operand value numbers.*"

Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 6,035,124 (issued Mar. 7, 2000) to Ng, of record, [hereinafter "Ng"]. See Oct. 16th Final, page 5, ¶ 9. The Ng reference was also discussed during the First Interview and briefly during the Second Interview. The Applicants respectfully submitted to the Examiner that,

since Ng is related to scalar operations and "global value numbering" as related to such scalar operations, Ng is a prior art system as is discussed in Applicants' Specification in the Background portion. See U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0198468 ¶ [0006] (published Sep. 8, 2005), [hereinafter "Spec."].

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 19 as amended are patentable over Ng, since Ng cannot accommodate the components of a superword register as recited in the claims. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 19, and the corresponding dependent claims that include the independent claims as base claims, have been placed in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 4, 2009

By: __/Joseph T. Cygan/_____
   Joseph T. Cygan
   Registration No. 50,937

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7945
fax: (312) 609-5005